Nietzsche and Tolstoy as Individualists of Instinct. But good reasons could be given for the inclusion of many important writers and movements which the writer has not included. The merit which he claims as common to all the thinkers classed as individualistic is that they have insisted on the personal aspect of morals: more particularly that they have recognized that the moral motive force is individual. This, he contends, is consistent with maintaining that the moral end is social or supra-individual. Further, he argues forcibly that the individual conscience can find no content and no opportunity for its exercise apart from social organization and unity.

The appreciation of historic forces is inadequate, though by no means absent. The author is well equipped for the task of writing the history of ethical thought and for the valuation of the social and intellectual forces at work in our own time.

W. J. ROBERTS.

University College, Cardiff, Wales.

SOCIOLOGY AND MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By Charles A. Ellwood, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, University of Missouri. New York: American Book Company, 1910. Pp. 331.

The reader must not expect to find in this book what its title might suggest, an outline of modern sociological principles. The author hastens to disavow in the preface any attempt "to give a systematic presentation of theory." He goes further to explain that he has left the student "to work out his own system of theory." The optimism of this plan is emphasized by the statement that the book is for use "where but a short time can be given to the subject" and is "especially suited for use in University Extension Courses and in Teachers' Reading Circles."

This sociology, with most of the sociology left out, consists of comprehensible discussions of the family and of a miscellaneous group of 'social problems,' the doctrine of population, immigration, the negro, the city, pauperism, crime, political socialism, and some aspects of education. The five chapters dealing with the family form the most nearly integrated portion of the book, and there is a slight suggestion of an intention of treating all the succeeding topics in relation to this central theme. The family ideal presented is not radical or iconoclastic; it is old-fashioned monogamy refined by the new democratic spirit,

the parents united by affection, and the children growing into comradeship rather than ruled by paternal authority. The treatment of each and all of these topics is suggestive, fair-minded, tolerant, and hopeful. The author acknowledges his obligations to three of his former teachers, Professors Small, Henderson, and Willcox, "directly or indirectly for much of the substance of the book."

FRANK A. FETTER.

Cornell University.

MONTAIGNE AND SHAKESPEARE AND OTHER ESSAYS ON COGNATE QUESTIONS. By John M. Robertson, M.P. London: A. & C. Black, 1909. Pp. vii, 358.

The object of this collection of essays is not merely to prove that Shakespeare borrowed extensively from Montaigne, but that the influence of Montaigne is "of that high sort in which he that takes becomes co-thinker with him that gives." The author is overconcerned perhaps to find analogies for commonplaces, such as the idea of "the country from whose bourne no traveller returns," and lays too little stress to the tags and methods of expression which are common to contemporary writers, though he frankly anticipates such a criticism in his introduction. However, Mr. Robertson has shown conclusively that sentiments and expressions, which posterity must regard as platitudes, have that elusive simplicity which requires a genius for their first conception. The very fact that they have passed into the common stock of human thought and speech is proof positive of their inspiration. Mr. Robertson's essays are, above all things, reasonable, and he declares himself emancipated from the abstract æsthetics of such writers as Coleridge, Schlegel, Knight, and even Swinburne, being content to prove that, after all, Shakespeare's materials belonged to the sixteenth and the preceding centuries. Poets should be judged, not by abstract æsthetic standards, the success of which reflects credit on the critic himself rather than on the poet, but by the measure of their ability to deal with the materials nearest at hand. Mr. Robertson, by implication rather than by definite statements, has pressed forward this view throughout the book, and has given the study of Shakespeare a new interest, delivering it from a class of critics whose methods recall the schoolmen. He is certainly no idolater,